REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 11, and 14 have been amended to address certain informalities, including typographical informality introduced in the preliminary amendment filed May 5, 2005. No new matter has been added. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are the independent claims.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claim 1 stands provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly claiming the same invention as claim 1 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/536,548 ("the '548 application"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because claim 1 of the present application is not directed to the same invention as that currently claimed in the '548 application.

Specifically, the claim 1 of the present application recites a "personal information utilization system" where the processing includes "receiving personal information," "checking the received personal information," and "identifying an information disclosing person as a result of the checking." In contrast, claim 1 of the '548 application is currently directed to a "commodity control system" that correlates identification information and adds the received client information to a storage means for each of a number of specific commodities.

Because the claim language of the present claim 1 is different than that of claim 1 of the '548 application, the two claims cannot be directed to identical subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the provisional double patenting rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0019817 to Matsui *et al.* ("Matsui"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Matsui fails to disclose *identifying an information disclosing person*, as claimed.

The present application is directed to a personal information utilization system that stores personal information and commodity provision information. In operation, the system may receiving additional personal information or additional commodity provision information. In response, the system may check the received information with that already stored in the database. Based on that *checking*, the system may *identify the information disclosing person* associated with either the personal information in this received by the system or commodity provision information received by the system. Thus, the actual identity of the information disclosing person may be determined.

Claim 1 recites *identifying an information disclosing person,* as a result of the checking, if the *received* personal information coincides with the person information *stored* in the storage means. Independent claim 2 recites a similar identifying in connection with commodity provision information *stored* in the storage means. Independent claims 6 and 7 have similar recitations, respectively.

In contrast, *Matsui does not identify any information disclosing person, as a result of checking,* as claimed. Matsui discloses a system for trading personal information, where the identity of the person is already known. Matsui's system does not even address the feature of checking existing data to identify the information disclosing person.

Rather, in Matsui's system, every user of an Internet Service Provider provides his or her personal information *directly* (Matsui ¶ 0008). The Internet Service Provider builds Matsui's database of personal information. Matsui does not even address identifying any information disclosing person by checking, as claimed, because Matsui's system already has the personal information received directly from the person himself.

Moreover, Matsui does address any claimed mode of identifying. For example, Matsui does not disclose identifying an information disclosing person *if the received personal information coincides with personal information* already stored in the database, as in claim 1. Matsui also doesn't teach identifying the information disclosing person *if received commodity provision information partially or completely coincides* with that stored in the storage means, as in claim 2, for example.

The Office Action cites a Matsui's username/password feature as teaching the claimed identifying (Office Action dated July 2, 2008 - page 4). However, Matsui's username/password feature does not identify information disclosing persons (*e.g.*, users who

have provided their personal information to the system). Rather, the username/password feature is used to authenticate users that login to the system to search the personal information that is already there (Matsui ¶ 0047).

Specifically, Matsui's stores personal information in a database system, such that the personal information may be subject to trading by companies (Matsui ¶ 0047). The companies may login to the system. It is the *companies* searching for personal information, not the people who have provided that personal information, that are authenticated by the username/password feature. This is consistent with the fact that in Matsui's system, personal information is provided directly from the individual user without any checking to identify the information disclosing person, as claimed. Thus, Applicant submits that Matsui does not teach all of the features of the independent claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-16.

Date: October 1, 2008   /Michael A. Koptiw/
                                              Michael A. Koptiw
                                              Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439